

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,669	MATSUNO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Kopec	1751	

All Participants:

(1) Mark Kopec.

(2) Barbara C. Siegel.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 April 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:

Saeki et al (5,035,837)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Claim 1 was amended to remove the recitation of V2O5 (see Reasons for Allowance). Note applicant is free to file a DIV application relating to the cancelled subject matter. Additionally, "use" claims 5 and 9 were corrected.

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)